

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9 and 11 have been canceled. Claims 10 and 12 have been amended. New claims 13-23 have been added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,936,386 (Heglund).

Examiner Interview

In telephonic interviews on August 19, 2005 and August 22, 2005, the Examiner generally reinforced the rejection of structural claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and affirmed that the invention disclosure included method details and relationships that if added to the method claim language should overcome the rejection in the July 27, 2005, Office Action based on Heglund. As suggested by the Examiner in the telephone interview of August 22, 2005, the structural claims have been canceled and the method claims have been amended to clarify and distinguish the method of the present invention from Heglund.

U.S. Patent No. 5,936,386 (Heglund)

The '386 patent discloses a method of linearizing the performance of switched reluctance generators.

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the '386 patent. However, the method disclosed in the '386 patent does not teach or suggest the steps of "selecting said BEMF value for said machine, wherein said BEMF value is selected at a first machine speed having a line-to-line peak voltage that is equal to a desired terminal voltage of said machine, said BEMF value having substantially equal amplitude to said desired terminal voltage at said first speed and wherein an electrical phase difference between said BEMF value and said terminal voltage is approximately zero" (claim 10) in combination with "selecting said machine inductance value for said machine, wherein said machine inductance value is selected based upon both a machine reactance value and a frequency value as a function of a proportional increase in said selected BEMF value between said first machine speed and a second machine speed, wherein the terminal voltage and a phase current are in phase" (claim 10).

Therefore, claim 10 is believed to be allowable. The language supporting the amendments to the claim can be found in the specification at page 7, lines 15-19, and page 8, lines 22-25. Claim 12 is believed to be allowable based on dependence on claim 10.

Applicants thus submit that the amended claims are not anticipated by the '386 patent and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants further submit that the amended claims 10 and 12 each define an invention which is unobvious over the '386 patent.

New Claims.

New claims 13-23 have been added to the present application. New claims 13 and 14 are each dependent on claim 10 and are therefore believed to be allowable.

The method disclosed in the '386 patent does not teach or suggest the steps of "selecting said BEMF value for said machine, wherein said BEMF value is selected at a first machine speed having a line-to-line peak voltage that is equal to a desired terminal voltage of said machine, said BEMF value having substantially equal amplitude to said desired terminal voltage at said first speed and wherein an electrical phase difference between said BEMF value and said terminal voltage is approximately zero" (claim 15) in combination with "selecting said machine inductance value for said machine, wherein said machine inductance value is selected as a function of a proportional increase in said selected BEMF value between said first machine speed and a second machine speed, wherein said second machine speed corresponds to a maximum delivered power, wherein said terminal voltage and a phase current are in phase and a resistive component of the machine reactance is zero" (claim 15). Therefore, claim 15 is believed to be allowable. Applicants further submit that claim 15 defines an invention which is unobvious over the '386 patent. New claims 16 and 17 are each dependent on claim 15 and are therefore also believed to be allowable.

The method disclosed in the '386 patent does not teach or suggest the steps of "selecting said BEMF value for said machine, wherein said BEMF value is selected at a first machine speed having a line-to-line peak voltage that is equal to a desired terminal voltage of said machine, said BEMF value having substantially equal amplitude to said desired terminal voltage at said first speed, wherein an electrical phase difference between said BEMF value and said terminal voltage is approximately zero and said first machine speed corresponds to a zero delivered power" (claim 20) in combination with "selecting

said machine inductance value for said machine, wherein said machine inductance value is selected as a function of a proportional increase in said selected BEMF value between said first machine speed and a second machine speed, wherein said second machine speed corresponds to a maximum delivered power, and wherein said terminal voltage and a phase current are in phase and a resistive component of the machine reactance is zero" (claim 20). Therefore, claim 20 is believed to be allowable. Applicants further submit that claim 20 defines an invention which is unobvious over the '386 patent. New claims 21-23 are each dependent on claim 20 and are therefore also believed to be allowable.

Applicants submit that the new claims 13-23 contain no new subject matter. The language supporting the new claims can be found in the specification, for example, on page 5, line 27 through page 6, line 11, and page 6, lines 28-30.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Office Action with respect to Claims 10 and 12 is requested. Allowance of new claims 13-23 is also respectfully requested.

In the event the examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Brendan Dix, Reg. No. 37,313
Michael A. Shimokaji
Attorney Registration No. 32, 303

Honeywell International Inc.
Law Dept. AB2
P.O. Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806
(310) 512-4886
Attn: Oral Caglar

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on

9/7/05



Michael A. Shimokaji, Reg. No. 32,303